



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

sumption that "everyone is supposed to know the law." See *Aldrich v. R. R. Co.*, 95 S. C. 427, 79 S. E. 316; *Kansas C. S. R. Co. v. Carl*, 227 U. S. 639. The maxim *ignorantia legis neminem excusat*, while often incorrectly expressed, is usually rightly applied. *Chicago, etc., R. Co. v. Kirby*, 225 U. S. 155. Though ignorance of the law excuses no one, everyone is not supposed to know the law. There is no such rule in law or equity. *Ryan v. State*, 104 Ga. 78, 30 S. E. 678; *Black v. Ward*, 27 Mich. 191, 15 Am. St. Rep. 162. It may be true that there is a *prima facie* presumption that everyone knows the law but this fails upon proof of positive misrepresentation relied on in good faith. *O'Neil v. Lake Superior, etc., Co.*, 63 Mich. 690, 30 N. W. 688.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—INTERSTATE COMMERCE—EFFECT OF STATE ANTI-TRUST LAWS.—The plaintiff in one State sold certain goods to the defendant in another, under a contract fixing the retail price of the goods, prohibiting the vendor from selling any other goods, and restricting sales to one county. In defense to an action to recover the purchase price of the goods, the vendee claimed the contract to be invalid under the State anti-trust laws. *Held*, the transaction is not affected by State anti-trust laws, since it involves interstate commerce. *Watkins Medical Co. v. Holloway* (Mo.), 168 S. W. 290.

It is well settled that contracts of sale only, in restraint of trade, between parties of different States, involve interstate commerce and are not affected by State anti-trust laws. *Hadley Dean Plate Glass Co. v. Highland Glass Co.* (C. C. A.), 143 Fed. 242; *Westmoreland Specialty Co. v. Missouri Glass Co.*, 169 Mo. App. 368, 152 S. W. 387. But, by the better view, where a contract involving interstate commerce, affects the subject-matter of the transaction when it has lost its character as interstate commerce, the contract is subject to State laws. *Watkins Medical Co. v. Johnson* (Tex.), 162 S. W. 394; *Fuqua v. Pabst Brewing Co.*, 90 Tex. 298, 38 S. W. 29, 35 L. R. A. 241. Thus where a combination was seeking to control both interstate and intrastate markets as to its products, the intrastate monopoly was declared subject to the State laws, though the products in question were shipped into the State from without. *Standard Oil Co. of Kentucky v. State* (Miss.), 65 South. 468. And in this connection, goods the subject of interstate commerce, become subject to State regulation in the bands of the original importer, when offered for sale by him in broken packages or by retail. *Fuqua v. Pabst Brewing Co.*, *supra*; *Leisy v. Hardin*, 135 U. S. 100.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—POLICE POWER—MEDICINE AND SURGERY.—A state statute authorized the State Board of Medical Examiners to revoke the license of any physician who should publish any advertisement relative to diseases of the sexual organs. *Held*, the statute is in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution. *Chenoweth v. State Board of Medical Examiners* (Col.), 141 Pac. 132. See NOTES, p. 150.

DAMAGES—PHYSICAL EXAMINATION—POWER TO ENFORCE.—The plaintiff was injured while on defendant's train. The defendant made applica-